UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,589	11/12/2003	Kirk Steven Tecu	10016363-1	7822

22879 7590 02/06/2007

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
PATEL, MANGLESH M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

me

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/706,589	TECU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Manglesh M. Patel	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 November 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *22-34* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 November 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *Mar 21, 2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This **Non-Final** action is responsive to the restriction requirement with elected claims 1-21 without traverse by applicant & IDS filed on March 21, 2005.

2. Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1 and 14 are independent claims. Claims 22-34 were subjected to restriction requirement.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on March 21, 2005 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.

Drawings

4. The Drawings filed on 11/12/03 have been approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. **Regarding independent claims 1 and 14,** which describes a system but fails to include any hardware components used with the system. Therefore the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, appropriate corrections are required.

Regarding Dependant claims 2-13, are rejected because they inherit the deficiencies of claim 1.

Regarding Dependant claims 15-21, are rejected because they inherit the deficiencies of claim 14.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1, 3, 13-14, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Microsoft (NPL—Make Web Pages Available for Offline Viewing, August 24, 2001, pgs 1-3).

Regarding Independent claims 1 and 14, Microsoft discloses a system comprising a Save As Multiple Files (SAMF) module configured to save an active file as multiple new files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2, wherein a save operation includes saving the current active web page as multiple new files that include graphics, frames and style sheets associated with the web page by saving as a complete web page).

Regarding Dependent claims 3 and 16, Microsoft discloses a file-type-determining module operative to determine a file format associated with the active file (pg 2/3, paragraph 2, wherein saving the web page as a complete web page includes a file type determining module to save the multiple files such as the graphics, frames and style sheets associated with the active web page).

Regarding Dependent claim 13, with dependency of claim 1, Microsoft discloses wherein the SAMF module comprises logic stored in a memory that is executed by a processor (pg 2/3, paragraph 2, wherein logic is stored in memory for performing the save operation as a complete web page which is executed by the processor to cause multiple files of the web page to be saved with a single save operation).

Regarding Dependent claim 16, with dependency of claim 14, Microsoft discloses determining a file format corresponding to the active file (pg 2/3, paragraph 2, wherein saving as a complete web page includes determining the file format of the active web page which also saves multiple files in their respective formats that are all associated with the active web page).

Regarding Dependent claim 19, with dependency of claim 14, Microsoft discloses prompting a user to select at least one of the following: a file format, a filename, and a location for each of the multiple new files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2, wherein the user is prompted for a filename).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft (NPL—Make Web Pages Available for Offline Viewing, August 24, 2001, pgs 1-3) in view of Jbrimm (NPL---Multiple file formats, Sep 2002, nnforums, pgs 1-3).

Regarding Dependent claim 2, with dependency of claim 1, Microsoft discloses a save as operation that saves an active web page as multiple files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2). However Microsoft fails to explicitly teach a SAMF operation. However Jbrimm discloses a SAMF-request-receiving module operative to receive a request to initiate a SAMF operation (pg 1/3, paragraph 2, wherein Jbrimm suggests multiple file save operation). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a save as multiple file operation. The motivation for doing so would have been to automatically save the active file as a complete web page that includes multiple files with one save operation thereby saving time.

Regarding Dependent claim 15, with dependency of claim 14, Microsoft discloses a save as operation that saves an active web page as multiple files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2). However Microsoft fails to explicitly teach a SAMF operation. However Jbrimm discloses prompting a user to select file parameters for the multiple new files (pg 1/3, paragraph 2, wherein Jbrimm suggests multiple file save operation). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to present multiple file parameters for the multiple new files associated with the active web page. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to save the files associated with the complete web page in multiple formats thereby associating each file type with the proper application thereby avoiding errors when reopening the file.

11. Claims 4-12, 17-18 and 20- 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft (NPL—Make Web Pages Available for Offline Viewing, August 24, 2001, pgs 1-3) in view of Jbrimm (NPL---Multiple file formats, Sep 2002, nnforums, pgs 1-3) further in view of CTL (NPL—Saving files, August 10, 2000, pgs 1-8).

Regarding Dependent claim 4, with dependency of claim 1, Microsoft discloses a save as operation that saves an active web page as multiple files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2). However Microsoft fails to explicitly teach a SAMF operation. Jbrimm suggests multiple file save operation (pg 1/3, paragraph 2). However Jbrimm fails to explicitly show the presentation of text file parameters to a user. CTL teaches a file-parameter-prompting

module operative to present text file parameters to a user (pg 2/8, paragraph 1, wherein text file parameters are presented to the user. Parameters such as file name, type and encoding associated with the file). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the presentation of text file parameters. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the default file name and supported file formats, thereby preventing an error when retrieving a file.

Regarding Dependent claim 5, with dependency of claim 1, Microsoft discloses a save as operation that saves an active web page as multiple files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2). However Microsoft fails to explicitly teach a SAMF operation. Jbrimm suggests multiple file save operation (pg 1/3, paragraph 2). However Jbrimm fails to explicitly show the presentation of text file parameters to a user. CTL teaches a file-parameter-prompting module operative to present image file parameters to a user, the image file parameters corresponding to a file format associated with the active file (pg 5/8, paragraph 4, wherein the Active file being saved is a WordPerfect file type and includes an associated image). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the presentation of image parameters associated with the active file. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the supported application by displaying the image associated with the application group thereby preventing an error when retrieving a file.

Regarding Dependent claims 6 and 17, Microsoft discloses a save as operation that saves an active web page as multiple files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2). However Microsoft fails to explicitly teach a SAMF operation. Jbrimm suggests multiple file save operation (pg 1/3, paragraph 2). However Jbrimm fails to explicitly show the presentation of text file parameters to a user. CTL teaches wherein the file-parameter-prompting module comprises an image-file-parameter-presenting module operative to present the image file parameters to the user when the file-type-determining module determines that the active file is an image file (pg 5/8, paragraph 4). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the presentation of image parameters associated with the active file. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the supported application by displaying the image associated with the application group thereby preventing an error when retrieving a file.

Regarding Dependent claims 7 and 18, Microsoft discloses a save as operation that saves an active web page as multiple files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2). However Microsoft fails to explicitly teach a SAMF operation.

Jbrimm suggests multiple file save operation (pg 1/3, paragraph 2). However Jbrimm fails to explicitly show the presentation of text file parameters to a user. CTL teaches wherein a text-file-parameter-presenting module operative to present the text file parameters to the user when the file-type-determining module determines that the active file is a text file (pg 2/8, paragraph 1). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the presentation of text file parameters. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the default file name and supported file formats, thereby preventing an error when retrieving a file.

Regarding Dependent claim 8, with dependency of claim 5, Microsoft discloses a save as operation that saves an active web page as multiple files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2). However Microsoft fails to explicitly teach a SAMF operation. Jbrimm suggests multiple file save operation (pg 1/3, paragraph 2). However Jbrimm fails to explicitly show the presentation of text file parameters to a user. CTL teaches wherein an image file parameter selection-receiving module operative to receive the image file parameter selections from the user (pg 5/8, paragraph 4). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the presentation of image parameters associated with the active file. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the supported application by displaying the image associated with the application group thereby preventing an error when retrieving a file.

Regarding Dependent claim 9, with dependency of claim 5, Microsoft discloses a save as operation that saves an active web page as multiple files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2). However Microsoft fails to explicitly teach a SAMF operation. Jbrimm suggests multiple file save operation (pg 1/3, paragraph 2). However Jbrimm fails to explicitly show the presentation of text file parameters to a user. CTL teaches wherein a text file parameter selection-receiving module operative to receive the text file parameter selections from the user (pg 2/8, paragraph 1). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the presentation of text file parameters. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the default file name and supported file formats, thereby preventing an error when retrieving a file.

Regarding Dependent claim 10, with dependency of claim 5, Microsoft discloses a save as operation that saves an active web page as multiple files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2). However Microsoft fails to explicitly teach a SAMF operation. Jbrimm suggests multiple file save operation (pg 1/3, paragraph 2). However Jbrimm fails

to explicitly show the presentation of text file parameters to a user. CTL teaches wherein the file-parameter-prompting module comprises: a same-file-format-adding module operative to add to the image file parameters presented by the image-file-parameter-presenting module additional image file parameters having the same file format as a selected image file format (pg 5/8, paragraph 4). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the presentation of image parameters associated with the active file. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the supported application by displaying the image associated with the application group thereby preventing an error when retrieving a file.

Regarding Dependent claim 11, with dependency of claim 5, Microsoft discloses a save as operation that saves an active web page as multiple files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2). However Microsoft fails to explicitly teach a SAMF operation. Jbrimm suggests multiple file save operation (pg 1/3, paragraph 2). However Jbrimm fails to explicitly show the presentation of text file parameters to a user. CTL teaches wherein the file-parameter-prompting module further comprises: a same-file-format-adding module operative to add to the text file parameters presented by the text-file-parameter-presenting module additional text file parameters having the same file format as a selected text file format (pg 2/8, paragraph 1). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the presentation of text file parameters. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the default file name and supported file formats, thereby preventing an error when retrieving a file.

Regarding Dependent claim 12, with dependency of claim 5, Microsoft discloses a save as operation that saves an active web page as multiple files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2). However Microsoft fails to explicitly teach a SAMF operation. Jbrimm suggests multiple file save operation (pg 1/3, paragraph 2). However Jbrimm fails to explicitly show the presentation of text file parameters to a user. CTL teaches a profile-processing module in communication with the file-parameter-prompting module, the profile-processing module comprising a profile-saving module that enables the user to save a profile of the user's file parameter selections on a profile memory that is operative to save a plurality of profiles (pg 2/8, paragraph 1). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the presentation of text file parameters. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the default file name and supported file formats, thereby preventing an error when retrieving a file.

Regarding Dependent claim 20, with dependency of claim 15, Microsoft discloses a save as operation that saves an active web page as multiple files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2). However Microsoft fails to explicitly teach a SAMF operation. Jbrimm suggests multiple file save operation (pg 1/3, paragraph 2). However Jbrimm fails to explicitly show the presentation of text file parameters to a user. CTL teaches wherein the means for prompting enables the user to select at least two new files with the same file format (pg 2/8, paragraph 1). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the presentation of text file parameters. The motivation for doing so would have been to indicate the default file name and supported file formats, thereby preventing an error when retrieving a file.

Regarding Dependent claim 21, with dependency of claim 15, Microsoft discloses a save as operation that saves an active web page as multiple files (pg 2/3, paragraph 2). However Microsoft fails to explicitly teach a SAMF operation. Jbrimm suggests multiple file save operation (pg 1/3, paragraph 2). However Jbrimm fails to explicitly show the presentation of text file parameters to a user. CTL teaches prompting enables the user to select at least two new files with the same file format (pg 2/8, paragraph 1). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to save a profile associated with the multiple file save operation. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to access a listing of previous multiple file parameter savings thereby saving time.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]].

Conclusion

References Cited

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Schoenzeit et al. (U.S. 5,619,624) discloses "Apparatus For Selecting A Rasterizer Processing Order For A Plurality Of Graphic Image Files"
- NPL (IconFactory, IconBuilder 2 [Quickly Save in Multiple Formats], pgs 1-7)

- NPL (Johnson, Photoshop CS2's Secret Hidden Image Processor, pgs 1-6)
- NPL (InformIT, Photoshop [Batch Process Photo with Image Processor], pgs 1-3)
- NPL (UltraShareware, Active Image Processing Software, pgs 1-2)
- NPL (Sivakumar, Cdocument::DoSave revealed, pgs 1-4)
- NPL (Kelby, The PhotoShop CS 2 Book for digital Photographers, pgs 1-9)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
February 3, 2007

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER